

field search and rescue training, wilderness survival, winter operations, aircraft crash rescue, and more. They live their high school career on call prepared to save lives.

When a person is lost in the Colorado mountains, the patrol's teenage volunteers handle dispatch, patrolling, active search and rescue, emergency medical care, and command of the operation.

In towns like Littleton, Englewood, and Aurora, they manage block searches and neighborhood canvassing to find lost children and elderly neighbors. Patrol members are also on scene for disasters like blizzards, floods, chemical spills, and commercial plane crashes, providing assistance to local police, fire, and the sheriff department.

I am proud to take a moment to honor the hundreds of young heroes who served admirably in the Arapahoe Rescue Patrol over the last 60 years, balancing their high school careers with the commitment to saving lives. We owe a debt of gratitude to these dedicated, service-minded young folks.

THE SIREN SONG OF EARMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, ever since the Magna Carta, it has been a settled principle of good governance that the power that appropriates public funds should not be the same power that spends them. This is at the heart of our Constitution, the separation of powers.

Simply speaking, it is mother's rule writ large. Mother has one slice of pie left and two hungry sons. How does she cut the pie so that both brothers are satisfied? One slices, the other chooses. One brother cannot abuse his powers precisely because of the powers accorded to the other.

And it is the same with our Constitution. One brother makes law, but cannot enforce it; the other enforces law, but cannot make it. One brother appropriates money, but cannot spend it; the other spends money, but cannot appropriate it.

Now, imagine how differently mother's rule would work if the same brother who sliced the pie also chose his piece.

Yet that is exactly the principle of congressional earmarks: Choosing the same slice of pie you have just cut or, more precisely, spending the same money that you have just appropriated. Nearly 1,500 earmarks, totaling \$5.7 billion, have been dropped into the so-called infrastructure bill alone since a bipartisan spending frenzy revived this corrupt practice this year.

This monumentally bad idea rests on two arguments. The first is that elected Members of Congress, and not unelected bureaucrats, should spend the people's money. The problem, of course, is that Representatives aren't

elected by all the people, only by their distinct constituencies. Representatives are inherently biased toward their own districts. That is why Congress is designed to act collectively.

Only the executive answers to the entire Nation and can resist the manifest excesses of a body controlled by 535 demanding constituencies and their district-focused Representatives. That is why appropriating money is a congressional function, and spending it is an executive one.

The second argument is that earmarks can grease legislation by buying off the votes of individual Members whose judgment would otherwise oppose a measure. Add a few local projects for that Member, and suddenly a bill he would never vote for on its merits becomes a local imperative overriding his sound judgment.

Please explain to me how that is a good thing.

And if earmarks are to be handed out as a reward for voting legislation, Members will prudently keep a list of earmarks handy as the demand for vote for any bill, whether or not they already plan to vote for it.

And this is not a theoretical discussion. We have learned the hard way what comes from breaching the Constitution's checks and balances.

The first problem is the corrupting nature of earmarks. When we place the power to appropriate and the power to spend in the same hands, we bypass the most important check that we have against corruption.

A local company produces a product the Pentagon neither needs nor wants.

Well, what to do?

Ingratiate yourself with the local Congressman; have him tell the Pentagon what it needs and who will provide it; and then reward him lavishly at election time and repeat. It should come as no surprise that many of the congressional scandals of the 1990s and 2000s arose from earmarks.

Second, earmarks bypass the normal process in which projects compete on their merits. Worthy projects don't need earmarks if appropriations are spent by the executive branch, according to well-established competitive, open-bid procedures. Earmarks are only required to protect unworthy projects from merit-driven competition. And even if there is such a thing as a good earmark, the price invariably is logrolling all the bad ones.

Third, earmarks harm the central tenet of federalism: That local projects should be financed by local communities, and Federal expenditures reserved for the Nation's general welfare.

When a local government proposes an earmark, what is it saying?

It is saying the project is so low on its priority list, it won't spend its own local taxpayers funds; but it is perfectly happy to have taxpayers in other communities foot the bill. The result is a grab bag of dubious projects that rob St. Petersburg to pay St. Paul for projects St. Petersburg doesn't deem

worthy enough to spend its own funds on, and that St. Paul pays for but receives no benefit from.

We have sung this old song many times before and it has never ended well.

REPEAL AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 256, Congresswoman LEE's legislation to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq.

In 2002, Congress voted to authorize the use of force against Iraq based on what would later prove to be false, baseless, and misleading intelligence provided by the Bush administration. A year later, Saddam Hussein was overthrown; a democratic government was established; and, finally, in 2011, a formal declaration of the end of our mission was announced.

But 10 years later, this authorization for the use of force remains on the books.

We must repeal this 19-year-old authorization that has been used and abused to justify expansive military actions across the globe. If we are serious about preventing forever wars, we must repeal the AUMF and exercise Congress' constitutional authority to declare war and peace.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important legislation.

INCREASING CORPORATE BOARD DIVERSITY

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 1187, the Corporate Governance Improvement and Investor Protection Act, and, specifically, the Meeks-Maloney amendment that we will consider today.

We show our priorities by our actions; and, today, we are not just talking about diversity, we are acting to improve diversity in the corporate boardroom.

I want to thank Mr. MEEKS, the sponsor of this amendment. He and I have worked on this issue a long time together, and I thank him for his leadership.

The goal of our amendment, the Improving Corporate Governance Through Diversity Act, is extremely important, increasing diversity on corporate boards. This is something I believe in passionately; and while we have made great progress, we still have a long way to go.

Getting more women, minorities, and individuals from historically underrepresented communities into corporate leadership positions is extremely important. Leaders set the tone, and they set the priorities.